

# **ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT SERVICES**

## **SELECTION COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, October 20, 2004**

## **MINUTES**

### **Members Present:**

**Chairman: Peter S. Corr**

**Public Member: George deTarnowsky**

**Agency Representative: Paul Witham, Associate Vice President for Development**

**>University of Rhode Island (URI):**

**A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by the Chairman. Minutes of the A/E/CS Selection Committee meetings of September 15, 2004 and October 7, 2004 were approved by G. deTarnowsky and W. Anderson (via memorandum). The following agenda items were addressed and voted upon by the Committee:**

**1. University of Rhode Island (URI): (9:09 a.m.)**

## **LOI #B03871 – Fund Raising Feasibility Study**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, P. Witham**

**Cost: \$185,000**

**P. Witham noted that, as a part of President Carothers three-year strategic plan, the university has made a decision to move forward to conduct a comprehensive capital campaign to supplement normal fund raising activities at the university. The university has not set a goal as yet, but hopes to raise approximately \$100,000,000 or more over a five-year period.**

**Mr. Witham further noted that, when planning for this type of campaign, it is typical for colleges and universities, both public and private, to engage outside counsel to conduct a feasibility study consisting of 60-100 interviews with those individuals identified as the best donor prospects. It is important to have third party representation for an objective real appraisal of the potential donors' interest in the campaign, their interest in supporting it, and at what level.**

**The purpose of this LOI is to hire a firm to conduct a campaign feasibility study among approximately 100 identified prospects over a four to five month period. In addition, the selected firm will provide periodic consult whereby a representative of the selected firm will come to the University once a month and consult on a variety of**

items.

**Recommendation:** Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Witham and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the University of Rhode Island's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Vice President for Administration, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of Benz Whaley Flessner, the most responsive and responsible of the 4 firms that responded to the LOI. (9:15 a.m.)

**2. Department of Administration (DOA): (9:17 a.m.)**

**A. RFQ #B03934 – Energy Performance Contracting Services**

**Voting Members:** P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, T. Howe

**Cost:** No Cost to State

**Each Site Will Pay a Percentage of Estimated Cost Savings**

T. Howe noted that this RFQ is the result of Rhode Island's greenhouse gas initiative action plan to meet the state's goal of

greenhouse gas reduction. This plan calls for the reduction of fossil fuel at the burner tip at buildings and facilities in the state. For this plan to be economically feasible for likely participants, it would be necessary to 'marry' a project with fast payback items, such as electrical savings.

Therefore, it is the purpose of the RFQ to solicit a firm for energy performance contracting services. The Agency contacted approximately 140 firms, sent out questionnaires, and received quite a few responses. The Agency also sent out letters to about 1350 large energy users in the state. This list was provided by Narragansett Electric and included customers with an average monthly demand over 100kw. 219 companies have indicated interest in this program, 50 of these are state facilities. The state Fiscal Fitness group is very interested in this program and would like full participation from state agencies.

Dr. deTarnowsky noted that RISE was not one of the respondents. Mr. Howe answered that they are listed under Chevron/Texaco.

Mr. Corr clarified that these firms would introduce energy saving devices at the locations and, in return, this would reduce gas at the tip. Mr. Howe responded that the requirement of the program is that something be done at the burner tip. Mr. Corr stated that the burner tip would be less utilized if energy conservation measures were introduced.

**Dr. deTarnowsky asked why four firms were needed. Mr. Howe responded that a walk through of each participating company would take place and then a common database created. Any of the four selected firms could then make a proposal to the participating company.**

**Mr. Corr clarified that the participating companies would be divided up among the four selected firms for the initial assessment and then data would be shared among the four firms. Mr. Howe answered yes.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Howe and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Administration/State Energy Office's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Associate Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the names of Chevron/Texaco, Noresco, Con Edison Solutions and Siemens, the most responsive and responsible of the 11 firms that responded to the RFQ. (9:25 a.m.)**

**B. RFP #B03935 – Owner Controlled Insurance Program (9:25 a.m.)**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, K. Carvalho**

**K. Carvalho noted that this is a program in which the insurances normally acquired by a contractor doing construction work for the state are acquired by the state as the owner. There is the opportunity for considerable savings in this way.**

**These potential savings accrue because, when contractors include insurance costs in their proposals, they add their profit margin to that cost. In large enough projects when the owner acquires the insurance, we would have savings at least of the profit margin which the contractors would normally apply to their cost of insurance. The real savings in one of these programs which includes usually the on-site workers compensation coverage and the liability coverage for the project, is that the broker provides loss control services that are normally not attributed to the projects. The broker will provide a manual of safety practices if the general contractor does not already have one. In addition, they will supplement the insurance companies that go on site with their own site visits. Between the broker and the insurance company there would be weekly on site loss control visits to identify potential exposures before they occur to further enhance savings.**

**Presently, when we require the contractor to furnish liability insurance, we require the state to be an additional named insured on that policy. Typically, that coverage is only for the liability of the**

**contractor in which the state is a named party. If there is joint liability between the state and contractor, the coverage acquired in having the state as an additional named insured on the contractor's policy will not represent the state in that situation. In this case, where the state acquires the insurance with the contractor as additional insured, we would enjoy the coverage.**

**We only require a contractor to carry \$1,000,000 of liability insurance, he then requires the subcontractors to carry a similar amount of coverage. In this case, we would be acquiring coverage in an aggregate of about \$25,000,000 rather than having 25 1 million dollar policies. We will not have the situation whereby a contractor or his subcontractors may already have claims which have exhausted their coverage with nothing remaining to the state. This coverage will only apply to the state project, so it will not be eroded by claims that may arise at other job sites.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Carvalho and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services**

**Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Administration/Risk Management Unit's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Associate Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of Arthur J. Gallagher, the most responsive and responsible of the 3 firms that responded to the RFP. (9:30 a.m.)**

**This item was approved, but it was later decided to defer action pending further review.**

### **3. Department of Health (DOH): (9:31 a.m.)**

**LOI #B03550A1 – Information Technology Needs for Emergency & Routine Functions**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, L. Green**

**Cost: \$194,366**

**L. Green and D. Reavey were present. L. Green noted that a year and a half ago, the Agency put together a strategic plan for public health informatics that included coordinating IT in all the divisions of the Department of Health. The Agency wishes to maximize the return on their investment and ensure synergy between various data sets and collection of information.**

**Mr. Green stated that the purpose of this LOI is to hire a firm to evaluate on an ongoing basis existing data sets utilized by the**

Agency and to suggest new approaches, such as emergency informatics. In the event of an emergency, the Agency wants their response to be up to date and state of the art. This LOI includes an evaluation of the Agency's ability to respond in an emergency, as well as to routine functions of the department as mandated by statute and regulation.

Mr. Corr asked if the LOI stated how much funding was available for this project. Mr. Green answered that the LOI stated a "not to exceed" amount of \$195,000.

Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Green and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Health's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration for the single name of HLN Consulting, the most responsive and responsible of the 3 firms that responded to the LOI.  
(9:35 a.m.)

4. Department of Environmental Management/Sustainable Watersheds Office (DEM):  
(9:37 a.m.)

RFP #B03692 – South Shore Salt Ponds Watershed Restoration Plan

Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, F. Presley

**Cost: \$72,000**

**F. Presley noted that the purpose of the RFP is to hire a firm to provide a water quality restoration plan for the South Shore Coastal Pond area with focus on the Green Hill and Ninigret Pond watersheds.**

**There are impacts to ponds from storm water and septic systems and numerous studies have been done by the Agency including TMDL (total maximum daily load) for bacteria, as well as many research studies done by URI with respect to nutrient loads to the ponds. This project is a focused approach on where these impacts are coming from.**

**The Agency is looking at ways to attenuate pollution in upland areas by doing drainage ditches, and infiltrating it before it gets to catch basins to reduce flow and increase groundwater flow. The vendor will identify the problem and recommend how to fix it. The vendor will provide a plan to the towns that they, in turn, can submit through the Agency for non-point source grants to mitigate those impacts. The vendor will provide a detailed prioritized plan that can include structural or non-structural mitigation techniques. The plan will address restoration for riparian areas along the streams as a way to mitigate impacts by reducing flow and getting more infiltration and, with respect to septic systems, both Charlestown and South Kingstown have worked to switch over the old systems to denitrification systems. The consultant will look at that process as well.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Presley and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Environmental Management's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Interim Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration for the single name of the Horsley Witten Group, the most responsive and responsible of the 8 firms that responded to the RFP. (9:41 a.m.)**

**5. Department of Elderly Affairs (DEA): (9:44 a.m.)**

**RFP #B03990 – Marketing Plan – Aging and Disability Resource Center**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, J. D'Agostino**

**Cost: \$89,985**

**J. D'Agostino noted that the purpose of the RFP is to hire a firm to develop a marketing plan to promote an Aging and Disability Resource Center that would combine services for the elderly, the elderly and disabled and the caregivers for elderly and disabled. The idea is to streamline the process, to have a one stop program to receive services across the spectrum; i.e., to combine services of the departments of Health, Human Services and Elderly Affairs.**

**The Technical Review Committee reviewed the work plan, organization and staffing, and experience background first before seeing the cost proposal.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Ms. D'Agostino and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Elderly Affairs' Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of Policy Studies, Inc., the most responsive and responsible of the 4 firms that responded to the RFP. (9:47 a.m.)**

**6. Department of Human Services (DHS): (9:50 a.m.)**

**A. RFP #B04022 – MMIS Fiscal Agent Services**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, F. Spinelli**

**Cost: \$73,790,117 (combined federal and state expenditure over 6 years)**

**F. Spinelli noted that the Agency has operated using a Medicaid Information System since 1993. Federal and state government requested that the Agency re-procure that contract. After doing an analysis, the Agency determined two options: to completely redesign the system or to solicit a takeover bid. Because so many changes**

were made to the system, the Agency chose the takeover bid. The Agency made every effort to balance the playing field; e.g., the Agency dropped the takeover costs below the line and decided to evaluate them only if the incumbent did not receive a bid.

Dr. deTarnowsky commended the Agency on their efforts to interest other vendors in submitting a proposal.

**Recommendation:** Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Spinelli and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Human Services' Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Acting Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of EDS, Inc., the only response to the RFP. (9:53 a.m.)

**B. RFP #B04140 – Supportive & Transitional Employment Services**  
(9:53 a.m.)

**Voting Members:** P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, D. Cook

**Cost:** \$1,070,370 as follows:

**Tri-Town CAP** \$195,628

**Urban League** \$196,434

**South Shore** \$200,000

**SER Jobs** \$282,596

**West Bay CAP** \$195,712

**D. Cook and L. Harrington were present. D. Cook noted that the Department of Human Services, Family Independence Program, is federally mandated to assist their clients in finding employment as quickly as possible. Supportive & Transitional Employment Services are two new services to facilitate employment for these clients and to provide support to them. Under Transitional Employment Services, for a finite period of time (3-6 months), the individual's wages are paid by the provider who is supporting them. Then, the individual is transitioned into the private sector as opposed to Supportive Employment where the individual immediately goes into the private sector, but they are closely supported while they are on the job until they are independent.**

**Dr. deTarnowsky asked if this is a pilot program. Ms. Cook answered that the concept of supportive employment has been here about fifteen years, but is usually used in the disability community. This is the first time it will be used in this way for individuals under the Family Independence Program. The transitional jobs concept is about ten years old.**

**Mr. Corr asked who pays for the transitional services. Is it the state? Ms. Cook answered that the respondents have stated they will do this for \$8,333. The state will pay the provider who will place the individual on their payroll and then transition them to the private sector. That is the reason that the cost of transitional employment is**

higher than supportive employment. The average cost for supportive employment is \$3,333.

Mr. Corr asked how was the decision made as to how many would be funded. Ms. Cook answered that was determined by budget constraints. One vendor, ProCap, was not recommended because they did not meet the criteria of the RFP.

Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Ms. Cook and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Human Services' Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Acting Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the names of Tri Town CAP, Urban League, South Shore, SER Jobs, and West Bay CAP, the most responsive and responsible of the 6 firms that responded to the RFP.  
(9:58 a.m.)

Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Ms. Harrington and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.

---

**Gail M. Walsh**

**Recording Secretary**

**Supporting documentation is on file at the Division of Purchases.**